

and 14-54 remain pending in the instant application, of which claims 1-3, 17, 25, 29, 33, 38, 41, 44, 49 and 52 are independent.

Turning now to the detailed Office Action, claims 14-16, 24, 28, 32, 37, 40, 43, 48 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first, second and fourth paragraphs. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons provided below, which were previously submitted in the Amendment filed May 29, 2002.

With respect to the rejection of claims 14-16, 24, 28, 32, 37, 40, 43, 48 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st paragraph as allegedly non-enabling, it is contended that the lack of a description of the claimed electronic devices in the specification does not rise to the level of non-enablement insofar as any such description would have been well known by one possessing ordinary skill in the art. In this regard, it has been held that a patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art. *In re Buchner*, 929 F.2d 660, 661, 18 USPQ2d 1331, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

In the present situation, each rejected claim requires an electronic device be selected from an *In re Markush* group consisting of a video camera, a digital camera, a goggle type display, a car navigation system, a personal computer, a mobile computer, a portable telephone, an electronic book, and an image playback device using a recording medium. Notwithstanding the claimed display device to which is structurally incorporated into each device, the conventional nature of each of the aforementioned devices is such that no undue experimentation would have been required to arrive at the missing information, and thus, are believed to be enabling at the time the invention was filed. Accordingly, inasmuch as the rejected claims are believed to be enabling to one of ordinary skill in the art, reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully solicited.

With respect to the rejection of claims 14-16, 24, 28, 32, 37, 40, 43, 48 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, please note that §2173.05(f) of the M.P.E.P. states that "a claim which makes reference to a preceding claim to define a limitation is an acceptable claim construction which should not necessarily be rejected as improper or confusing under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph." In this regard, it is

contended that the rejected claims are believed to be definite to one of ordinary skill inasmuch they refer to a preceding claim to define a limitation. Notably, each rejected claim is directed to an electronic display device that includes an electroluminescence display device defined by their respective independent claims.

Accordingly, inasmuch as the rejected claims are believed to define subject matter that would be considered definite by one of ordinary skill in the art, reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully solicited.

With respect to the rejection of claims 4, 9, 14, 19, 24 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 4th paragraph as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, please note further that §608.01(n) of the M.P.E.P. states:

“A dependent claims does not lack compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, 4th paragraph, simply because there is a question as to (1) the significance of the further limitation added by the dependent claim, or (2) whether the further limitation in fact changes the scope of the dependent claim from that of the claim from which it depends. The test for a proper dependent claim under the fourth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 is whether the dependent claim includes every limitation of the claim from which it depends.”

It is contended that the rejected dependent claims are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, 4th paragraph insofar as they are each directed to an electronic device that includes an electroluminescence display device in accordance with the respective claim from which they depend. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 5, 17, 20, 23, 33, 36, 44 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as unpatentable over Yamada (U.S. Patent No. 6,246,179 – hereafter Yamada). In response, Applicants are in the process of preparing a verified English translation of priority document Japanese Patent Application Serial No. 11-158787, which was filed on June 4, 1999, prior to effective U.S. filing date of the Yamada reference which is November 30, 1999. As a completed verified translation is available, Applicants shall submit the same to the Examiner.

Claims 17 and 25 have been amended, as shown above, to recited features of claims 1 and 2, respectively.

In view of the arguments and amendments to set forth above, the §102(b) rejection is respectfully requested to be reconsidered and withdrawn. Moreover, in addition to the arguments set forth above with respect to the §112 rejections of claims 14-16, 24, 28, 32, 37, 40, 43, 48 and 51, the arguments and amends in relation to the §102(b) over Yamada are also applicable to the §112 rejections. Hence, the §112 rejections are respectfully requested to be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 14, 24, 37 and 48 are rejected 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Yamada and Tang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,684,365 of record). As these claims are dependent claims of claims 1, 17, 33, and 44, the arguments and amendments set forth above are also applicable to the §103 rejection.

CONCLUSION

Having responded to the rejection set forth in the outstanding non-Final Office Action, it is submitted that claims 1-10 and 14-54 are now in condition for allowance. An early and favorable Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. In the event that the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, the Examiner is courteously requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,


Luan C. Do

Registration No. 38,434

NIXON PEABODY LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 800
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 770-9300

JLC/LCD/wks

4317

MARKED-UP COPY OF AMENDED CLAIMS:

17. (Amended) An electroluminescence display device comprising:
a substrate; and
a plurality of pixels over the substrate, each of the plurality of pixels comprising:
a first thin film transistor;
a second thin film transistor comprising a gate electrode electrically connected to the first thin film transistor; and
an electroluminescence element electrically connected to the second thin film transistor,
wherein the first thin film transistor comprises at least two gate electrodes over the substrate, at least two channel regions corresponding to the gate electrode, over the gate electrode with a gate insulating film interposed therebetween, and an impurity region interposed between the channel regions, and
wherein the impurity region has the same impurity concentration as a source or drain regions of the first thin film transistor.

25. (Amended) An electroluminescence display device comprising:
a substrate; and
a plurality of pixels over the substrate, each of the plurality of pixels comprising:
a first thin film transistor;
a second thin film transistor comprising a gate electrode electrically connected to the first thin film transistor; and
an electroluminescence element electrically connected to the second thin film transistor,
wherein the first thin film transistor comprises at least two gate electrodes over the substrate, at least two channel regions corresponding to the gate electrode, over the gate electrode with a gate insulating film interposed therebetween, and an impurity region interposed between the channel regions, [and]
wherein a channel width of the second thin film transistor is greater than a channel width of the first thin film transistor, and



wherein the impurity region has the same impurity concentration as a source or drain regions of the first thin film transistor.